


United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/030,565	07/01/2002	Ivano Zorzan	17642-57	8762
33717	7590 03/17/2004		EXAM	INER
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP			NOLAND, KENNETH W	
	ADO AVENUE, SUITI	E 400E	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SANTA MON	ПСА, СА 90404		AKI UNII	FAFER NUMBER
			3653	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

,		\hookrightarrow				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/030,565	ZORZAN, IVANO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kenneth W Noland	3653				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply						
A SHOR*TENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>July1</u>						
· <u> </u>						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 49	03 U.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are pending in the application.						
_ , ,	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
<u> </u>	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) 1.7 and 9 is/are rejected.					
·_						
	oloolion roquitomonia					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: 1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicat	ion No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau		- 4				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	ea.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Dotice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/	6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3653

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 7, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Valle in view of Serge.

Valle discloses a dispenser having a magazine (M) to hold articles in separate sections (seats). Note the delivering device T and a cash or credit card receiving unit. To provide that Valle's dispenser dispense rolls of film, as well as, to deliver a coded carrier to the roll, would be obvious in view of the teachings of Serge's use of dispensing rolls of film (Fig. 21, as well as, a device for delivering a coded carrier whereby the code is associated with the roll (see pg. 7, lines 6-11).

3. Claims 2-6 and 8 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

KENNETH W. NOLAND PRIMARY EXAMINER

Noland/vs March 17, 2004